



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

is included in the collection. These deductions lessen the ratio of the *das*-clauses to those with *was*, but still leave the former in the majority.

The author also includes among the *das*-clauses all clauses introduced by *welch*. Insofar as it is merely a question of determining the territory of *was*, this seems justifiable; but inasmuch as it is in some degree a question of the gradual restriction of *das*, which was used in the eighteenth century more generally than it is now, the relations between *das* and *welches* should also be considered. We must reckon, for instance, with the fact that not a few persons avoid more or less the use of any form of *der* as a relative after an antecedent that is also a form of *der*, particularly the use of the same word for both antecedent and relative, e. g., *der: der, das: das*, while on the other hand the extent to which *welch* is used, varies not a little with different writers. The issue, therefore, seems to be not wholly one between *was* on the one hand and *das* or *welches* on the other, but from another point of view one between *das* on the one hand and *was* and *welches* on the other. The superlatives, which show such a large preponderance of *was*-clauses, are in nearly every instance preceded by *das* (or *des, dem*); while *alles*, which is classified by the author with the superlatives, but which is not ordinarily accompanied by such a determinative, shows a much smaller proportion of *was*-clauses, namely 3 *was* to 3 *das* (+ 1 *alles das was*). While the total number of such cases presented is too small to warrant a very definite assertion, it seems safe to say that if due allowance were made for the tendencies mentioned, the author's general conclusion, that the qualitative difference between *das* and *was* consists in the more determinative function which the former has assumed since the eighteenth century, is even more generally true than his figures would indicate.

The author promises to make a detailed examination of earlier writers as well as of the living dialects. We suggest that in that case modern prose-writers outside of the realm of philosophy should also be examined to a greater extent than has been done. More than one-half of the material so far examined is taken from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, which is certainly an amount so disproportionate that it cannot fail to effect the general result by giving undue weight to individual usage,

while on the other hand the most widely read authors, who are most likely to represent and influence general usage, are either not represented at all or only in comparatively small amounts.

H. C. G. VON JAGEMANN.

Harvard University.

---

## SPANISH LITERATURE.

*Estudios de Historia Literaria de España*, por D. EMILIO COTARELO Y MORI, de la Real Academia Española. Tomo I. Madrid, 1901.

The well-known scholar and critic, D. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori has here collected a number of essays on Spanish literature which he had contributed to various journals, and has published them in book form, amplified and improved by his own later investigations and by availing himself of the works of other scholars which have appeared since their original publication. An idea of the importance of these *Studies* may be formed from the following partial list: *El supuesto Libro de las Querellas del Rey d. Alfonso el Sabio*; *El Trovador Garcé-Sánchez de Badajoz*; *Las Imitaciones castellanas del Quijote*; *Juan del Encina y los Orígenes del Teatro Español*; *Lope de Rueda y el Teatro Español de su Tiempo*.

Students of Spanish literature that still had any doubt about the spuriousness of the *Libro de las Querellas* of Alfonso the Wise, will be entirely relieved of them by reading the searching article with which Sr. Cotarelo opens this volume. The genuineness of this work had been questioned long ago by such scholars as Wolf and Ticknor, but no direct evidence was produced by them. Here the subject is examined with a thoroughness that conveys conviction, and the *Libro de las Querellas* is shown to have been a fabrication of that *falsario aragonés*, as Sr. Cotarelo calls D. José Pellicer de Osau y Tovar, a voluminous writer of the seventeenth century, and the friend of Góngora and enemy of Lope de Vega.

In the article on Garcé-Sánchez de Badajoz, which contains some curious information about this mad trobador, Sr. Cotarelo denies that the Sánchez de Badajoz of the *Cancionero General* is

identical with "Badajoz, el Músico," and asserts that the *Músico de la Corte portuguesa*, whose name is Juan, is still a third person. The essays on Juan del Encina and Lope de Rueda are the most important in the volume, as they are also the longest, occupying nearly two hundred pages. Juan del Encina, the first writer of distinction for the Spanish stage, was born in Salamanca in 1468, or perhaps 1469. Nothing is known of his family, and there has been some question even as to his real name. What is certain, Sr. Cotarelo tells us, is that "by the name of Encina he was known, not only here but in Italy, and he never used any other." He studied at the University of his native city the humanities, philosophy and perhaps also theology. At the University he was the protégé of D. Gutierre de Toledo, brother to the second Duke of Alba, into whose service he afterwards, towards the close of 1492, entered.

Encina composed verses at the age of 14, and by the time he was 25 he had written nearly all the lyrical compositions which are found in his *Cancionero*. It was while serving the Duke of Alba at his seat, Alba de Tormes, that he wrote the dramatic pieces which are the foundation of his renown. The first edition of his *Cancionero* was published at Salamanca in 1496. It contained, beside the lyrical poems, eight farces,—*representaciones* two were called,—the others he calls *églogas*.

In December, 1498, Juan del Encina obtained the post of *cantor* in the cathedral of Salamanca, after which he is lost sight of for a long time. He afterwards went to Italy—when is not known—attracted thither, it has been surmised, by the kindness with which Spaniards had been received by popes Calixtus III. and Alexander VI. In Rome he remained several years. He seems to have been back again in Spain in 1509, in which year he was named *arcediano mayor* of the cathedral of Málaga. Juan del Encina made at least three—perhaps four—voyages to Rome: the journey just mentioned, and again in 1512, 1516 and probably also in 1519. While at Rome he was very favorably received, and in 1513 one of his plays—probably *Plácida y Victoriano*, as Menéndez y Pelayo has conjectured—was performed at the house of Cardinal de Alborea, the poet taking part in the representation. The account of this performance is quoted by Sr. Cotarelo from d'An-

cona, *Origini del Teatro italiano*, Vol. II, p. 82. It is not without interest as a picture of the society which at that time filled the palaces of the princes of the church. I quote it here, supplying the omission of Sr. d'Ancona:

"Zovedi a' 6, festa de li tre Re, il sig. Federico . . . si ridusse alle xxiii ore a casa del card. Arborensis, invitato da lui ad una comedia . . . Cenato dunque, si ridussero tutti in una sala, ove si aveva ad rappresentare la comedia; il pred. Rev.<sup>mo</sup> sedendo tra il sig. Federico, posto a man dritta, e lo ambador di Spagna a man sinistra, et molti vescovi poi a torno, tutti spagnuoli; quella sala era tutta piena de gente, et piu delle due parte erano spagnoli, et piu puttane spagnole vi erano che homini italiani, perchè la comedia fu recitata in lingua castigliana, composta da Joanne de Lenzina, qual intervenne lui ad dir le forze et accidenti di amore: et per quanto dicono spagnoli non fu molto bella, et poco delettò al S. Federico."

(See also Arturo Graf, *Attraverso il Cinquecento*, Torino, 1888, p. 264.)

Encina afterwards went to the Holy Land in the retinue of the Marquis of Tárrifa, and returned to Rome in 1520. According to Gil González Dávila he died in Salamanca, his native city, in 1534, and was buried in the cathedral. Sr. Cotarelo also takes up the various plays of the poet and examines and discusses them at considerable length.

Perhaps the most important essay in the volume is the one on Lope de Rueda. And right at the beginning Sr. Cotarelo calls attention to the fact that the progress that had been made in the secular drama by Bartolomé de Torres Naharro was not continued by his successors, and that a period of stagnation followed in Castile, which lasted, with rare exceptions, until the appearance of Lope de Rueda. There can be no doubt that the *farsas*, *coloquios*, *tragedias*, *comedias* and what else they were called, which were produced for nearly half a century after the appearance of the *Propaladia* of Torres Naharro, marked a distinct step backward. The works of the illustrious *extremeño* seemed to be without influence upon his countrymen. Various reasons have been assigned for this, and they are mentioned by Sr. Cotarelo. One reason is that his works having been written in Italy, they were not generally accessible. But he points out that after the first edition of Naharro at Naples, in 1517, quite a number appeared in other places: at Seville in 1520, 1526, 1533 and 1545;

at Antwerp about 1550, and at Madrid in 1563, 1573, and others. In view of this array of editions it cannot well be maintained that the comedies of Naharro were unknown in Spain. Nor can the fact that they were prohibited by the Holy Office account for it. Sr. Cotarelo believes that the true cause of the lack of popularity of the plays of Torres Naharro is to be found in their very perfection. In other words, having been produced in Italy, where the comedia had attained a degree of development unknown in Spain, they could not at once be adopted in the latter country, and besides, the rude state of the appointments and scenic apparatus of traveling companies of players at that time in Spain (we see from the *Prólogo* to Cervantes's Comedias that all the effects of such a troupe of players consisted of false beards and a blanket for a curtain) made their representation in the public squares almost impossible. Whatever the true reason may have been, the fact that the theatre in Spain was uninfluenced by the plays of Naharro for a long period, seems undisputed. Lope de Rueda, the founder of the Spanish comedia, as Lope de Vega calls him, a native of Seville, and a gold-beater by trade, has the rare distinction of having the greatest of all Spaniards for his biographer, for all that was known of him up to recent times, is what Cervantes says of him in the *prólogo* to his Comedias (1615). It is not known when Lope de Rueda was born—perhaps in the first decade of the sixteenth century—nor do we know the date of his death. According to Cervantes, he died in Córdoba, where he was buried in the *iglesia mayor*. By a happy chance his last will was discovered about a year ago, and from it we learn that his father's name was Juan de Rueda, that that of his wife, who survived him, was Angela Rafaela, and that they had an only daughter named Juana, who died at an early age in Córdoba.

The life of the *histriones* in Spain at this time—especially at about the beginning of Lope de Rueda's career—was not an enviable one. Sr. Cotarelo mentions an ordinance of March 9, 1534, issued by D. Carlos and his mother, Da. Juana, concerning the garments and ornaments to be worn by players, which had to be different from those ordinarily worn, in order to distinguish them from other social classes. To stigmatize a particular

class of the community by obliging its members to wear some distinctive garment was a common enough practice in Europe about this time. We know that a few years later, in 1549, by a rescript of Duke Cosimo the *cortigiane* of Florence were obliged to wear a yellow veil, "*a fine che elle sien conosciute dalle donne da bene e di honesta vita*," etc. (Salvatore Bongi, *Il Velo giallo di Tullia d'Aragona*, Firenze, 1886, p. 10). It is recorded that the famous poetess Tullia d'Aragona, who fell under this category, protested against wearing this hateful stigma, and was excused therefrom through the aid of her friend, Benedetto Varchi, the Duke granting the favor because she was a poetess and endorsing her petition with the words: "*Fasseli gratia per poetessa*." (*Ibid.*, p. 12).

So the evil reputation of players in Spain since the time of the *Siete Partidas* of Alfonso the Wise, in which they are denominated *facedores de juegos de escarnio, remedadores*, etc., continued to pursue them. This did not, however, prevent Lope de Rueda from joining a company of strolling players, and in 1554 we find him a full-fledged *autor de comedias*, with a company of his own. Subsequently to this date Sr. Cotarelo prints a number of documents concerning Rueda, one of them dated September, 1561, shows that our author was then in financial difficulties—a complaint as old, apparently, as the profession itself—and that his theatrical wardrobe, "*que no seria muy rico ni abundante*," was attached for a debt of 22 ducats, as he was about to leave with his wife for Valencia, the birthplace by the way, of his wife.

It was in Madrid, then, and about this time, that Cervantes, then a youth of perhaps 14, first saw Lope de Rueda with his company. The date of Rueda's death, as already mentioned, is not exactly known, but he was already dead on October 7, 1566, for that is the date of the *censura* of the posthumous collection of his works published by his friend Joan Timoneda at Valencia in 1567. He probably died not long after March 21, 1565, the date of his last will and testament, made in Córdoba when he was so ill that he was unable to sign his name. The above edition of Lope de Rueda's works consisted of four comedias, two *coloquios pastoriles* and a short dialogue in verse "*sobre la invención de las calzas*."

Sr. Cotarelo concludes his very interesting essay

with a careful examination of the *comedias, coloquios, pasos*, etc., of Rueda's that have survived, discussing their origin—they are all from Italian sources—and follows this with a careful bibliography, and finally, in an appendix, he describes a hitherto unknown work of our poet, from a manuscript in possession of Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo—a satirical work entitled *Flor de medicina*. Sr. Cotarelo's *Estudios de Historia Literaria de España* is a book of exceeding interest, containing much that is new, and should be read by every student of Spanish literature.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

#### ROMANCE VERSIFICATION.

*Zur Lateinischen und Romanischen Metrik*, von Professor Dr. FRIEDRICH HANSSEN. Valparaiso: Helfmann, 1901, pp. 80. Separatabdr. Verhndl. Deut. Wissensch. Vereins in Santiago (Chile), iv, S. 345–424.

This investigation deals with the nature and origin of the Classic, that is, metric, rhythmic and Romance syllable-count. We are already indebted to Dr. Hanssen for a valuable article on Spanish and Portuguese Metrics, 1900. The present essay is valuable, not so much on account of any new theories or original views, but on account of the material made accessible to those interested in the origins and relation of Romance versification to Latin poetry of early Christian times.

The author is of the opinion that it is wrong to oppose the accentual metrical system of the *neueren Kulturvölker* to the quantitative of the Greeks and Romans; this has led to confusion and done a great deal of harm. The basis of Romance metrics is syllable-count, hence, *quantitierend*; the essential fact is that both systems have a definite number of *Takteinheiten*, and this holds as well for the later Greek and Latin rhythmical poetry. There is a close relation between the Romance and the metrical system, thus opposing the views of Huemer and others who maintain that “für das Metrum das Quantitätsprinzip, für den Rhythmus das Accentuationsprinzip in der Verskunst massgebend war.”

Starting from this view-point, Dr. Hanssen first discusses in a general way the quantitative and accentual versification, and this part is highly suggestive. Suffice it to mention one point that most verse technicians overlook. The physiological laws or principles of rhythm are everywhere alike, but in some respects they have traveled different roads. The rhythmic feeling is by no means the same everywhere; and in verse-structure habit and education have a greater influence than nature, contrary to general opinion. This point seems of the utmost importance, in the opinion of the writer, to a safe guide and sure appreciation of the relation between the Romance and Classical verse-structure and its development. So much criticism in verse-technique is based entirely on the individual feeling and on an appreciation that necessarily follows therefrom, and which invariably calls forth a different standard of critical measure. And here we venture to say that the reason why German criticism on French verse-technique, especially on the subject of rhythm, in general, is fundamentally wrong, is the fact that the German critic takes a wrong standard, a standard based on a German acoustics and not on a Latin. Not until one is able to thrust aside the individual, inherent feeling is it possible to appreciate different verse principles. From this standpoint Professor Stengel is probably the greatest living verse-technique critic.

In the second chapter, “Beziehungen zwischen Reim und Silbenzählung,” the author shows that the difference in rhyme in Latin and Romance is based on the difference of the nature of their syllable-count; many examples of entire poems are given to show the nature and development of verse-division and rhyme.

The chapter “Der Accent in der Spanischen Metrik” is of exceptional value, because so little reliable work has been done in this field.

In the chapter “Der Lateinische Zehnsilbner” one point is especially interesting, outside of the many examples cited, he shows that the paroxytonic and proparoxytonic verse-end was not a *Verwild-erung*, but eine *Altertümlichkeit* (p. 45).

Under “Rhythmische Daktylen und Anapäste” the nature of the ictus in the Classical verse is discussed; the author agrees with Bonnet (*Amer. Jour. Philol.*, xix, xx) that verses were to be read